arXiv:1604.04814v1 [astro-ph.SR] 17 Apr 2016

The influential effect of blending, bump, changing period and eclipsing Cepheids on the Leavitt law

A. García-Varela, J. R. Muñoz, B. E. Sabogal

Universidad de los Andes, Departamento de Física, Cra. 1 No. 18A-10, Bloque Ip, A.A. 4976, Bogotá, Colombia

and

S. Vargas Domínguez

Universidad Nacional de Colombia - Sede Bogotá - Facultad de Ciencias - Observatorio Astronómico - Carrera 45 No. 26-85, Bogotá - Colombia

and

J. Martínez

Universidad de los Andes, Departamento de Ingeniería Industrial, Edificio ML, Cra 1 Este No 19A - 40, Bogotá, Colombia

josegarc@uniandes.edu.co, jr.munoz2198@uniandes.edu.co, bsabogal@uniandes.edu.co, svargasd@unal.edu.co, j.martinez144@uniandes.edu.co

Received _____; accepted _____

ABSTRACT

The investigation of the non-linearity of the Leavitt law is a topic that began more than seven decades ago, when some of the studies in this field found that the Leavitt law has a break at about ten days.

The goal of this work is to investigate a possible statistical cause of this non-linearity. By applying linear regressions to OGLE-II and OGLE-IV data, we find that, in order to obtain the Leavitt law by using linear regression, robust techniques to deal with influential points and/or outliers are needed instead of the ordinary least-squares regression traditionally used. In particular, by using M- and MM-regressions we establish firmly and without doubts the linearity of the Leavitt law in the Large Magellanic Cloud, without rejecting or excluding Cepheid data from the analysis. This implies that light curves of Cepheids suggesting blending, bumps, eclipses or period changes, do not affect the Leavitt law for this galaxy. For the SMC, including this kind of Cepheids, it is not possible to find an adequate model, probably due to the geometry of the galaxy. In that case, a possible influence of these stars could exist.

Subject headings: Stars: Variables: Cepheids, Magellanic Clouds, Methods: Statistical Analysis

1. Introduction

By studying variable stars in the Small Magellanic Cloud (SMC), Henrietta Leavitt discovered a linear relation between the pulsation period and magnitudes of 25 Cepheids, in the sense of that the brightest Cepheids have longer periods (Leavitt & Pickering 1912). This correlation, commonly called Period-Luminosity (PL) relation, was lately renamed as the Leavitt law (LL) in honor to its discoverer (Freedman & Madore 2010).

This linear statistical correlation is a cornerstone in the measurement of the extragalactic distances using stellar standard candles. However, in order to obtain an accurate calibration of this relation, it is important to establish the effects of non-linearities, metallicity and companions on it, as it is mentioned by Madore & Freedman (1991); as well as other effects such as Cepheids showing the Hertzsprung progression and Cepheids exhibiting changes in period. A brief literature review of these issues is presented below.

i) The non-linearity effect: the first works in this direction began twenty five years after the discovery by Henrietta Leavitt. In a study of the shape of the PL relation of nearby galaxies, Kukarkin found that this relation has a break around 10 d (Kukarkin 1937; Fernie 1969). Three decades later, Sandage & Tammann (1968, 1969) found evidence of curvature in the PL relation, and afterward, Tammann, Sandage & Reindl (2003) confirmed the break of the PL relation in 10 d. Kanbur & Ngeow (2004) confirmed again this result based on the statistical F-test. In the last years, the following studies have confirmed the non-linearity of the LL without proposing an explanation for it: the testimator method (Kanbur et al. 2007), the approaches of linear regression residuals and additive models (Koen, Kanbur & Ngeow 2007), the multi-phase PL relations (Ngeow et al. 2012) and the multiple least-squares regression (García-Varela, Sabogal & Ramírez-Tannus 2013).

ii) The metallicity effect: By using non-linear convective pulsating models, Caputo, Marconi & Musella (2000) and Marconi, Musella & Fiorentino (2005) studied

synthetic multiband PL relations of populations of Cepheids of different chemical compositions, uniformly distributed over the instability strip. The masses of these stars follow the law $dn/dm = m^{-3}$, and are distributed in the range of $5 - 11\ M_{\odot}$. For a wide range of $\log P$, those authors found clear evidence that the optical LL is better represented by a quadratic relationship than by a linear one, showing a dependence with the metallicity and the intrinsic width of the instability strip. For IR bands they showed that the LL is better fitted by a linear function showing a slightly dependence on the metallicity.

Udalski et al. (2001) and Pietrzyński et al. (2004) found strong evidence in favor of the universality of the optical PL relation, in the metallicity range from -1.0 dex to -0.3 dex. Gieren et al. (2005) and Fouqué et al. (2007) found that the slopes of the PL relations in VIW_I do not change significantly between the environments of the Milky Way and the LMC.

iii) The companion effects: Physically bound companions to Cepheids are difficult to detect at distances of tens of kpc. To produce a detectable effect on the light curve, the eclipses should be deep enough and a significant number of points associated with the eclipses should be observed. The first condition is reached with an adequate combination of radius, luminosity and effective temperature of the primary and secondary stars, jointly with the appropriate inclination and mass ratio of the system. These eclipsing systems exhibit light curves similar to those of Cepheids, showing besides dispersed points below them, which are a signal of the eclipses (Udalski et al. 1999a, Fig. 7). When the Cepheid light curve is subtracted, it emerges a typical eclipsing signal (Soszyński et al. 2008, Fig. 3).

Nun et al. (2014) claim to detect a few Cepheids in eclipsing systems in the Galactic Bulge and the Magellanic Clouds, using a random forest supervised algorithm over the MACHO catalog of variable stars. However, due to these variables do not show a clear period of eclipses, it is difficult to affirm that they are binaries. It is very likely that these

stars are blended with near neighbors. Soszyński et al. (2015) reported few Magellanic Clouds Cepheids that could be blended, and also others that could be members of binary systems.

Detection of Cepheid systems whose light curves exhibit eclipsing variations is too important: if the Cepheid is a member of a physical binary system, it is possible to determine dynamical masses, radii and distance with a very high accuracy. Until now, spectroscopic studies of double-lined eclipsing binary systems in the LMC have been made by the Optical Gravitational Lensing Experiment (OGLE) in the systems: OGLE-LMC-CEP-0227[1] (Pietrzyński et al. 2010), OGLE-LMC-CEP-1812 (Pietrzyński et al. 2011), OGLE-LMC-CEP-1718 (Gieren et al. 2014), OGLE-LMC-CEP-2532 (Pilecki et al. 2015) and OGLE-LMC562.05.9009 (Soszyński et al. 2012, Gieren et al. 2015) a system detected in the OGLE Gaia South Ecliptic Pole Field.

iv) The Hertzsprung progression effect: Inspecting light curves of 37 Cepheids, Hertzsprung (1926) found a relation between the position of a bump feature in the light curve and the pulsation period. Later studies confirmed that this bump feature is present in the light and radial curves of fundamental-mode classical Cepheids whose periods are in the range of $6 - 16$ d (Bono et al. 2000). This feature is present in the descending branch for pulsations in the range of $6 - 9$ d. For longer periods, this feature is observed in the ascending branch and disappears for periods longer than 20 d (Bono et al. 2000, Gastine & Dintrans 2008). The amplitude bump grows when the period increases, reaching its maximum value for periods near to the maximum light around $10 - 11$ d. For longer periods, the amplitude bump decreases until it vanishes (Keller & Wood 2006).
There are two models that explain some of the properties of the observed bump feature. The first one, called the echo mechanism, proposes radial-pressure waves generated in the

[1]The ID is given according to the OGLE nomenclature

He II ionization region (Christy 1968). The traveling inward wave is reflected in the core and reaches the surface one period later, leading to the formation of the bump (Bono et al. 2000). However, this model has two points to solve: the contradiction with the acoustic-ray formalism (Whitney 1983; Aikawa & Whitney 1984, 1985) and the difficulty of predicting adequately the Christy wave velocity near to the stellar surface (Karp 1975, Bono et al. 2000).

The second model, known as the resonance mechanism, proposes that the feature bump arises from a resonance between the fundamental mode and the second overtone (Simon & Schmidt 1976). By using numerical simulations Gastine & Dintrans (2008) studied the nonlinear saturation of the acoustic modes excited by the $\kappa-$mechanism. They found that this 2:1 resonance causes that the bump appears in the ascending branch for $P_2/P_0 < 1/2$.

v) The changing period effect: The long-term observations detect several thousand oscillation cycles for short period Cepheids. This allows to determine, with very high accuracy, changing periods. For the long period Cepheids, it is no possible to reach this accuracy, because the data have in the worse cases of sampling, tens of cycles. There are three scenarios explaining different characteristics of the period change rates. The first one proposes that the evolutionary changes on the stellar structure of Cepheids crossing the instability strip are responsible of the period change rates (Turner et al. 2006; Fadeyev 2013). The second one proposes that the presence of magnetic fields is a possible explanation for the random changing periods exhibited by some Cepheids. The last one suggests that the amplitude and phase variations of Cepheids are caused by an analogous to the Blazhko effect, exhibited by RR Lyræ stars (Molnár, L. & Szabados 2014). Soszyński et al. (2015) reported a few Cepheids that could be exhibit this Blazhko effect, being the number of these Cepheids larger in the LMC than in the SMC.

The period changes should produce a shift of the phase in the light curve, and as a consequence, a higher scatter in the light curve, detectable on years of observations. A study of 655 LMC Cepheids found period changes in 18% of the fundamental mode, and in 41% of the first overtone (Poleski 2008, Table 3). A visual inspection of the light curves of these OGLE Cepheids shows, for the most of them, a strong scatter of the points as a consequence of the shift phase.

Since there are a few studies about magnetic fields on cool radial pulsating stars, it is not clear if the nature of these magnetic fields are fossil or are produced as a consequence of the stellar pulsation (Wade et al. 2002). Based on a solar-like magneto-convective cycle, Stothers (2009) could explain the observed period change rates of two short period Cepheids: Polaris and V473 Lyr. As the existence of local magnetic fields on the surface of late-type stars causes spots (Strassmeier 2009), Neilson & Ignace (2014) proposed that convective hot spots can be a possible explanation to the random changes in the pulsation period detected in the single Cepheid observed by the Kepler mission, V1154 Cyg.

The first detection of magnetic fields in variable stars was made on RR Lyræ (Babcock 1958). Measurements of magnetic fields for Cepheid stars began later on. In particular, for α Car and γ Cyg there were reported values of 700 G (Weiss 1986), and from $\sim$ 100 G to $\sim$ 350 G (Severny et al. 1974; Plachinda 1990), respectively. The spectropolarimetric works over the bright bump Cepheid η Aql ($V = 3.90$, $P = 7.17$ d) reported controversial results. While Plachinda (2000) and Butkovskaya et al. (2014) measured periodic variations of the longitudinal magnetic field with an amplitude of tens of Gauss, Wade et al. (2002) found a non-significant detection of the longitudinal magnetic field at a level of 10 G.

In order to establish whether or not the effects previously described are influential on

the LL, we make a study using statistical techniques. We start-off, in the second section, with a brief description of the LMC LL and the OGLE-II and OGLE-IV Cepheid data. The third section is dedicated to review the statistical theory of the linear regression analysis, relevant for this work. The fourth section presents the results of applying statistical models in order to obtain optical LL of the LMC and SMC. Finally, our main conclusions are given in the fifth section.

2. LMC Leavitt law with OGLE data

OGLE-II and OGLE-IV observations of Cepheid variables of the LMC and SMC galaxies were collected with the 1.3-m Warsaw telescope, at Las Campanas Observatory, Chile (Udalski et al. 1999a, Udalski et al. 1999b, Udalski et al. 2015). While OGLE-II fundamental mode Cepheid catalogs contain 771 and 1319 stars for the LMC and SMC, respectively, OGLE-IV has a nearly complete collection (2429 and 2739 for the LMC and SMC, respectively), covering practically the whole Magellanic System area with the time baseline, a little more than five years. (Soszyński et al. 2015).

The slope and zero point of the LMC LL in optical VI-bands were computed by Udalski (2000) using ordinary least-squares (OLS) regression, on OGLE-II fundamental-mode Cepheids. Points deviating by more than 2.5σ (outliers) were removed by applying the sigma-clipping algorithm (Udalski et al. 1999c). Udalski realized that standard deviation of residuals of the LMC data was almost two times smaller than that of the SMC. This greater dispersion is caused mainly by the spatial distribution of Cepheids in the SMC bar, whose thickness is placed along the line-of-sight with a typical depth of ~ 0.25 mag (Harris & Zaritsky 2006). These facts, and the manner in which the LL of the LMC is much better populated for periods longer than 2.5 d, suggested Udalski to adopt as the universal slope value the one obtained for the LMC, notwithstanding that the number

of Cepheids in the SMC was around twice that of LMC. For OGLE-IV LMC Cepheids the slope and zero point of the LL were determined in analogous approach, but the SMC slope was obtained independently, using only Cepheids of this galaxy (Soszyński et al. 2015).

With the aim to establish a possible statistical cause of the non-linearity of the LL, we use the dereddened sample of OGLE-II . fundamental mode Cepheids belonging to the LMC and SMC galaxies reported by Udalski et al. (1999a) and Udalski et al. (1999b), as well as the nearly complete collection of OGLE-IV Magellanic Clouds Cepheids reported by Soszyński et al. (2015).

3. Linear regression analysis

In this section we summarize the topics of the statistical theory of linear regression analysis, most relevant to this paper.

We start explaining what the outliers and influential points are. Then, we present the theory of ordinary least square method and the conditions to apply it. Next, we describe the statistics tools to identify influential points. Then, we present the specification test, which verifies if all variables involved in a statistical problem are adequately included and represented by a proposed model. Following, we present the structural break test, which looks for unstable parameters. Finally, we present the robust M-regression that allows to do a linear regression of data with no-Gaussian error distribution. The MM-regression is applied in order to get a high breakdown point and fit the models in presence of influential points that are outliers at the same time.

An extended statistical discussion of these topics can be found in Montgomery, Peck & Vining (2012). Some applications in the astronomy context can be found in Feigelson & Babu

(2012).

3.1. OLS statistical theory

The most common method to estimate parameters in a linear regression model is OLS, based on the Gauss-Markov theorem. The model is (in matrix notation):

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{y}$ is the dependent variable vector, $\mathbf{X}$ is the independent variables matrix, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the parameters vector and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ is the errors vector.

This theorem states that the OLS estimators are the best linear unbiased estimators if the expected value of the errors vector is zero ($E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \mathbf{0}$), the variance of the errors is constant ($V(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) = \sigma^2\boldsymbol{I}$) and the errors are uncorrelated. It can be shown (Montgomery, Peck & Vining 2012) that OLS estimators ($\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$) are obtained from:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{y}, \tag{2}$$

Notice that: $\mathbf{0}$ is the nule vector, $\boldsymbol{I}$ the identity matrix and $\boldsymbol{A}'$ indicates $\boldsymbol{A}$ matrix is transposed.

Once the model is fitted the adequacy must be checked. That is: i) the error term $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ has a constant variance $\sigma^2\boldsymbol{I}$. ii) The errors are uncorrelated. These items are the Gauss-Markov theorem assumptions. iii) The errors are normally distributed. This is very important for making hypothesis testing and estimating confidence intervals. iv) All the observations have approximately the same weight. It refers to the fact that it is not desirable that model estimators depend more on few observations than on the majority of them. This could happen if some observations, called influential points, have a disproportional impact in the OLS estimations. v) There is no specification problems in the model and there is not a

structural break, i.e. the parameters are stable. It refers to the correct functional form of the model.

After fitting the model, a residual analysis is made to verify its adequacy. Since the residuals are the difference between the original observed values and their fits, they also measure the variability of the dependent variable which is not explained by the model. Therefore, any violations to the assumptions can be detected by analyzing model residuals. Mainly the analysis on residuals is looking for evidence of: i) errors come from a distribution with heavier tails than normal. Large departures from normality in the error distribution mean that the F- and t- test are not longer valid as well as the confidence interval estimations. ii) Heteroskedasticity, meaning that the errors do not have constant variance. iii) Influential points. iv) Specification problems. v) Autocorrelated errors. In this study it is not necessary to check if errors are correlated because the data are not time dependent, i.e. they come from a cross-section in the statistical sense.
For checking the error distribution a normal probability quantil-quantil ($Q-Q$) plot is used. If all the residuals lie along a line, it means that they come from a normal distribution. For more details see Montgomery, Peck & Vining (2012). This plot shows if the distribution has heavier or lighter tails or if it is skewed compared to the normal distribution.

For checking the assumption that errors have constant variance (homoskedasticity) the White's test (White 1980) is used in the following equation:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \mathbf{e}, \tag{3}$$

where $\mathbf{e}$ is the residual from the linear regression defined as:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} = \mathbf{e} = \mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}. \tag{4}$$

This test does not make the assumption that errors come from a normal distribution. Its null hypothesis is that $\sigma_i^2 = \sigma^2$ for all i. Since the PL relation can be modeled as a simple

linear regression, the test uses the auxiliary model given by

$$e_i^2 = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 x_i + \alpha_2 x_i^2 + u_i \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \tag{5}$$

where u_i is the error term and n is the number of stars. It can be shown that White's statistic nR^2 is asymptotic distributed as χ^2 with g-1 degrees of freedom, where n is the number of observations and R^2 is the regression coefficient of determination of the equation (5). Because the auxiliary model (equation 5) has three parameters ($g = 3$) the χ^2 has 2 degrees of freedom.

3.2. Outliers and influential points

Outliers are points that have an unusual behavior. Let us imagine a scatter plot, outliers are data points that unusually are located out of the pattern or far from the data cloud. On the other hand, influential points are those data that have a disproportional impact on OLS estimators (slope and zero point). As a result, the model estimators depend more on them than on the majority of data. Let us imagine the scatter plot again, a regression line is fitted with all points. Then we delete a point and fit the regression line once more. If the regression line obtained after removing the point changes a lot; the deleted observation is an influential point. What is a lot? Statistics helps us in this decision, as we shall describe later. Now, let us imagine the scatter diagram with a far point from the cloud of data points, but located along the regression line. If we delete it, the regression line will not change. Therefore, the point is an outlier but not an influential point, because it affects the R^2 coefficient and the OLS estimator standard errors, but not the OLS regression estimators. On the contrary, if the outlier affects the regression coefficient estimators it is also an influential point. Finally, let us imagine that the point is not an outlier; however, after deleting it, the new regression fitted-line is very different from the obtained with it.

This means that it is an influential point. In general, influential points can or cannot be outliers.

Detection of influential points: in order to look for influential points Cook's distance, *DFFITS, DFBETAS, COVRATIO* statistics are commonly used (Montgomery, Peck & Vining 2012). The first of them is defined as follows:

$$D_i = \frac{(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(i)})'(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(i)})}{p\widehat{\sigma}^2}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \tag{6}$$

Basically, it measures the square distance between the OLS $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ estimate, based on all observations and OLS $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(i)}$ estimate obtained after deleting the ith observation, where p in equation (6) is the number of parameters in equation (3), i.e. the number of independent variables plus the zero point. Moreover, $\widehat{\sigma}^2$ is an estimate of the mean square error, defined as follows:

$$\widehat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{\mathbf{e}'\mathbf{e}}{n-p}. \tag{7}$$

Observations with large Cook's distance affect OLS estimates of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. To know what is a large Cook's distance, D_i is compared to the $F_{0.5(p,n-p)}$ distribution (Montgomery, Peck & Vining 2012). If the ith observation has a $D_i > F_{0.5(p,n-p)}$, it is considered an influential point.

DFFITS measures how large is the influence of the ith observation on its own estimated $\hat{y}_i$. In other words, it shows how many standard deviations $\hat{y}_i$ change due to delete the ith observation. It is defined as follows:

$$DFFITS = \frac{\hat{y}_i - \widehat{y}_{(i)}}{\hat{\sigma}_{(i)}\sqrt{h_{ii}}}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \tag{8}$$

$\hat{y}_{(i)}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{(i)}$ are the fitted values and the standard deviation respectively, obtained without the ith observation. The term h_{ii} is the ith diagonal element of the matrix $\mathbf{H}$ that

is defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-\mathbf{1}}\mathbf{X}' \tag{9}$$

The term h_{ij} is the amount of leverage that the ith observation has on the jth fitted value. A point is considerate influential when $|DFFITS| > 2\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}}$. For complementary explanations and references about *DFFITS* and the $\mathbf{H}$ matrix see Montgomery, Peck & Vining (2012) and Drapper & Smith (1998).

Other statistics that detects influential points is *DFBETAS*. It indicates how much effect has the ith observation on each β_j, measured in standard deviation units. In order to apply it, the coefficient estimators of β_j obtained using all observations are compared with the coefficient estimators computed excluding the ith observation ($\beta_{j(i)}$). As a result, a measure for each β_j is obtained. The *DFBETAS* statistics is defined as follows:

$$DFBETAS_{j,(i)} = \frac{\hat{\beta}_j - \hat{\beta}_{j(i)}}{\hat{\sigma}_{(i)}\sqrt{C_{jj}}} \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, p \tag{10}$$

where $\mathbf{C} = (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-\mathbf{1}}$, so that C_{jj} is the jth diagonal element of the matrix $\mathbf{C}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{(i)}$ is the square root of the regression mean square error fitted without the ith observation. An observation is considered an influential point if $\left|DFBETAS_{j,(i)}\right| > \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}$.
The last statistics used to detect influential points is *COVRATIO*, that measures how the covariance matrix is affected by the ith observation. It compares the generalized variance of the parameters estimators, obtained without the ith observation, with that obtained using all observations.

The variance-covariance matrix of parameters estimators with all observations is:

$$Var(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \hat{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1} \tag{11}$$

The generalized variance is the determinant of the equation (11):

$$GV(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \left|\hat{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}\right| \tag{12}$$

Given this, *COVRATIO* is defined as follows:

$$COVRATIO_i = \frac{\left|\hat{\sigma}^2_{(i)}(\mathbf{X}'_{(i)}\mathbf{X}_{(i)})^{-1}\right|}{|\hat{\sigma}^2(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1}|} \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \tag{13}$$

The *ith* observation is considered influential if its *COVRATIO* lies out of the following interval $1 - \frac{3p}{n} < COVRATIO_i < 1 + \frac{3p}{n}$, where p is the number of parameters in the equation (3) and n is the total number of observations.

The reported LL in this work are obtained by rejecting from the sample the influential points, and Cepheids exhibiting the communalities, explained later. However, two questions arise that require detailed answers: Why is it important to identify these influential points and give them an statistical treatment? Why is it necessary to apply robust techniques to make a linear regression instead of applying a well-known algorithm as sigma-clipping? In the next paragraphs, we answer these questions, illustrating the associated statistical problem.

Outliers are observations with anomalous behavior. When they are caused by human errors or instrumental failures, they can be recognized and excluded from the analysis. Moreover, they can be rejected from the analysis only if there are strong non-statistical reasons that support such decision. In this work it is possible to reject them based on astronomical reasons. However, the usual practice of deleting outliers without making a further analysis looking for reasons that could explain their behavior, could imply serious consequences in the estimators precision, because they are adjusted artificially (Montgomery, Peck & Vining 2012).

As a result, when there are not astronomical reasons that support excluding those

points and/or there are influential points, robust estimation methods are needed.

3.3. Specification tests

To validate that there is no evidence of specification errors in the model, we use tests to look if a non-linear combination of the fitted values are significant to explain the response variable. One of them is the Ramsey's test given by the equations (14) to (16) (Ramsey 1974). The other one, is a variant proposed by Godfrey and Orme that uses only the model given by equation (14) (Godfrey & Orme 1994). These auxiliary models and their respectively hypotheses used in this work are the following:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \alpha_1\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{2}} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{14}$$

The null and alternative hypothesis are $H_0 : \alpha_1 = 0$ and $H_1 : \alpha_1 \neq 0$

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \alpha_1\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{2}} + \alpha_2\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{3}} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{15}$$

The null and alternative hypothesis are $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$ and $H_1 :$ At least one $\alpha_i \neq 0; \quad i = 1, 2$

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \alpha_1\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{2}} + \alpha_2\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{3}} + \alpha_3\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{4}} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{16}$$

The null and alternative hypothesis are $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = 0$ and H_1: At least one $\alpha_i \neq 0; \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$

If any of these tests are significant because there is evidence to reject the null hypothesis H_0, then there is enough evidence of misspecification. In fact, it means that a non-linear combination of the fitted values are significant to explain the variability in the dependent

variable, i.e the functional form is incorrect.

3.4. Structural breaks

To verify if there are structural breaks, dummy variables are used. Before explaining what a dummy variable is, it is necessary to give a brief explanation about qualitative variables. Qualitative or categorical variables are those that do not have a natural scale of measurement. In this study two categorical variables are used. The first variable indicates which data set the observation belongs to when data are divided in two sets, to make structural tests to the models. This variable has two categories: data set 1 and data set 2. The second variable is the galaxy name where the Cepheid is located, which also has two categories: LMC and SMC.
Dummy variables are used to indicate which category from a qualitative variable the observations belong to. Each dummy variable takes two possible values: 1 if the observation belongs to the category that the dummy variable is representing, and 0 if not. If a qualitative variable has K categories, it can be represented by K dummy variables, one for each category.

However, only $K-1$ dummy variables are used in the regression model. Besides, it does not matter which $K-1$ dummy variables are used since $\mathbf{H}$ matrix is the same, independently of which dummy variable is taken out to fit the model. In fact, dummy variables representing the categories of a qualitative variable are linked between each other because when one of them takes a value of 1 for an observation, the others take 0 for the same observation. Therefore, when all the $K-1$ dummy variables in the model take a value of 0, they are representing the dummy variable that is no present in the model. For more details see Montgomery, Peck & Vining (2012).

The process of verifying the existence of structural breaks is made as follows: the data are divided in two data sets by dummy variables. Then, a model that includes the dummy variables is estimated to verify if the estimated parameters associated with dummies are significant or not. If they are significant, the parameters are unstable, thus there are structural breaks.

To contrast hypothesis the $P-$value is used. It means the lowest level of significance that leads to reject null hypothesis when it is true. Therefore, if $P-$value is greater than the significance level, there is not enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis. On the contrary, if the $P-$value is less than or equal to the significance level there is enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative one, which means the test is significant.

3.5. *M*-regression

Sometimes OLS assumptions are not accomplished; for example, errors have a distribution with heavier tails than normal distribution and/or there are influential points. An alternative to fit a linear model in these kinds of scenarios is a robust regression, in which the residuals can be defined as follows:

$$e_i = y_i - \mathbf{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta} \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \tag{17}$$

It is convenient to scale the residuals by using median absolute deviation:

$$S = \frac{median\,|e_i - median(e_i)|}{0.6745} \tag{18}$$

Therefore the scaled residuals (u_i) can be expressed as follows:

$$u_i = \frac{y_i - \mathbf{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta}}{S} \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \tag{19}$$

If scaled residuals are not dependent between them, and all of them have the same distribution $f(u)$, the maximum likelihood $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ estimators are those that maximize the

likelihood function:

$$L(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} f\left(\frac{y_i - \mathbf{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta}}{S}\right) \tag{20}$$

In Drapper & Smith (1998) is shown that this condition is equivalent to minimize the equation (21). Therefore, a class of robust estimator that minimizes this equation is called M-estimator and the regression based on it is called M-regression. M comes from maximum-likelihood since function $\rho(u_i)$ is related to equation (20) for a proper choice of the error distribution.

Besides, $\rho(u_i)$ weights the scaled residuals u_i in the sum:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho\left\{\frac{y_i - \mathbf{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta}}{S}\right\} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \rho(u_i) \tag{21}$$

There are more than one suggestion for $\rho(u_i)$ in the literature, the function used in this work is the Tukey's bi-square, with parameter equal to 6 (Kafadar 1983). For further information about this function and other choices see Drapper & Smith (1998). To minimize the equation (21) the first partial derivative of $\rho(u_i)$ must be calculated:

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \beta_j} = \psi\left\{\frac{y_i - \mathbf{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta}}{S}\right\} = \psi(u_i) \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, p \tag{22}$$

As a result, the following equation is obtained:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{ij}\psi\left\{\frac{y_i - \mathbf{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta}}{S}\right\} = 0, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, p \tag{23}$$

p is the number of parameters in the model. Multiplying the equation (23) by u_i/u_i, it is obtained:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{ij} w_i \left(\frac{y_i - \mathbf{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta}}{S}\right) = 0, \quad j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, p \tag{24}$$

where $w_i = \psi(u_i)/u_i \;\forall\; y_i \neq \mathbf{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta}$, otherwise is 1.

The determination of M-estimator is an iterative process, thus, the M-estimator for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\boldsymbol{q+1}} = (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{W}_q\mathbf{X})^{-1}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{W}_q\mathbf{y} \tag{25}$$

This iterative process stops when a convergence criteria is reached, i.e. when the estimators change less than a preselected amount in the $q+1$ iteration. Notice that the equation (25) is the weighted least square estimator where $\mathbf{W}_q$ is a diagonal $n \times n$ matrix of weights whose elements are w_i. See Drapper & Smith (1998) and Montgomery, Peck & Vining (2012) for a wider discussion.

3.6. *MM*-regression

In the context of M-regression it is important to check that there are no bad influential points, i.e. observations that are outliers in the $\mathbf{X}$ space and influential points at the same time. In this scenario the MM-estimator (Yohai 1987) should be used because it has a high breakdown point (BDP). In a finite-sample the BDP is the smallest fraction of contaminated data causing a divergence of the estimator from the value that it would take if data were not contaminated (Montgomery, Peck & Vining 2012).

The MM-estimator combines the asymptotic efficiency of M-estimator with the high BDP estimators such as $S-$estimators and Least Treammed Squares. MM-regression is obtained in three steps. First, a high BDP parameter estimators model is calculated to compute the residuals of the model. Second, based on residual computed in the previous step, a M-estimate of scale with high BDP is calculated. Finally, the model parameters are estimated using M-estimators and the scale estimation computed in the previous step. Neither normal errors nor homoskedasticity are assumptions in M-regression and MM-regression. However, these regressions assume that errors are uncorrelated, which is not an issue when data come from a cross-section, meaning that data are not time dependent. Robust regressions are based on asymptotic results. This means they could lead to wrong results when they are used with small data sets. Montgomery, Peck & Vining (2012) say that small to moderate sample size could be less than 50 points. In our case, the smallest

data set has about 400 observations. Hence, we have enough data to apply these techniques without problems. In particular, OGLE-IV has around two and three times of observations for the SMC and the LMC than OGLE-II, respectively.

4. LMC and SMC Leavitt law regressions

The statistical theory explained previously are applied for each one of the LMC and SMC galaxies. The following models are fitted by OLS:

$$\mathbf{V_0} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \mathbf{LP} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{26}$$

$$\mathbf{I_0} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \mathbf{LP} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{27}$$

$$\mathbf{W_I} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \mathbf{LP} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{28}$$

LP is $\log_{10} P$ and P is the pulsation period of a Cepheid. In general, these models have violations to the OLS assumptions, as it will be shown below.

Influential points are data that truly affect the linear regression results, although they can or cannot be outliers. It is very important that the studies of the LL make an appropriate treatment of those points. Deleting a subset of influential points does not prevent the appearance of new influential points, as will be shown below.
The sigma-clipping algorithm is an iterative procedure commonly used in Astronomy in order to reject the outliers in OLS regression. However, to apply the OLS regression its assumptions must be accomplished. In order to investigate if the OGLE-II data do not fulfill these conditions, we make an experiment in V-band using the whole sample of 765 OGLE-II LMC fundamental mode Cepheids. We apply the sigma-clipping algorithm using five iterations and an optimum threshold of 2.5σ. These values are the same used in the studies of the LL made by Udalski et al. (1999a) and García-Varela, Sabogal & Ramírez-Tannus (2013). Simultaneously, we apply the White's test to check if the assumption of

homoskedasticity is fulfilled.

Before the first sigma-clipping iteration, the White's test finds enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis of homoskedasticity with a P-value of 0.0165 at 5% of significance. A number of 79 influential points are detected using some of the Cook's distance, *DFFITS, DFBETAS,* and *COVRATIO*. On the other hand, by applying the criteria of the sigma-clipping algorithm, 27 points are rejected in the first iteration, not all of them identified as influential points. During second iteration, the White's test finds again enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis of homoskedasticity with a P-value of 0.0483 at 5% of significance and 76 influential points are identified. By using sigma-clipping algorithm 22 points are rejected. In the following three iterations influential points are detected again. Taking into account these facts, we notice that the main problems of applying the sigma-clipping algorithm in the context of the LL are:

i) OLS estimators obtained by using this procedure are not adequate since their precision are adjusted artificially (Montgomery, Peck & Vining 2012).

ii) In the two initial iterations, the models have no a constant error variance, i.e., they show heteroskedasticity. In the remaining iterations, the models show homoskedasticity, as a result of deleting points using the sigma-clipping criterium.

iii) The residuals in each iteration have distributions with heavier tails than the normal distribution.

iv) Influential points are detected on each iteration.

Summarizing, rejecting outliers using the sigma-clipping algorithm is not adequate in this case, since there are violations of OLS assumptions. Without strong reasons to support the rejection of points, this method is invalid in the LL linear regression context.

As we mentioned before, models (26) to (28) have violations to the OLS assumptions:

for Cepheids belonging to the LMC galaxy, White's test (explained in §3.1) finds enough evidence of heteroskedasticity with $P-$values of 0.0165 and 0.0579 for models (26) and (27) at 6% of significance. On the contrary, for model (28), White's test does not find enough evidence to reject its null hypothesis because of its $P-$value of 0.4806, that is greater than the same fixed level of significance. For Cepheids belonging to the SMC galaxy, White's test does not find enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis of homoskedasticity with $P-$values of 0.3430, 0.3247 and 0.1599 for models (26) to (28) respectively, at 5% of significance.

Another problem is the influential points that are found in all models in both galaxies. As we have mentioned above, this fact makes necessary to search for communalities in the influential points to understand the causes of this behavior. To do that, the I-band light curves of all Cepheids in the LMC and SMC are visually inspected many times. As a result, we identify two main morphological characteristics in them: the dispersion and the shape. Using these communalities we perform a bi-dimensional classification of the Cepheids in some of the following groups: light curves with small (1), moderate (2), or large (3) dispersion. And light curves whose morphological shapes are sinusoidal-like (A), sawtooth-like (B) or exhibit bumps, i.e. showing the Hertzsprung progression (C). Dispersion of light curves of Cepheids classified as 2 and 3 seem to be caused in several cases by blending, since a visual inspection of the finding charts of these Cepheids, shows neighbors near to the stars. Representative examples of this classification are shown in Figure 1.

The bi-dimensional classification of all OGLE-II LMC and SMC fundamental mode Cepheids is given in Table 2. The last column reports our bi-dimensional classification: morphological shape is given by A, B or C, and the grade of dispersion is measured by the discrete scale: 1, 2 or 3, the last one being the corresponding to light curves with larger dispersion. An appended i letter indicates that this star is detected as influential point by



Fig. 1.— Morphological classification of I-band light curves of selected Cepheids of the Magellanic Clouds. The IDs are given according to the OGLE nomenclature.

at least one of the DFFITS, DFBETAS or COVRATIO statistics, computed from VIW_I data. In Table 1, the number of Cepheids belonging to each sub-class is reported.

When the influential points are correlated with our bi-dimensional classification, an interesting fact arises: around one third of the LMC Cepheids and one fifth of the SMC Cepheids, classified with a grade of dispersion moderate and large are influential points. Taking this fact into account, and in order to avoid violations of OLS assumptions, we propose the following hypothesis: If Cepheids with light curves of moderate and large dispersion, exhibiting characteristics suggesting blending, bumps, eclipses and period changes, are excluded from the OLS linear regression, and the remaining data do not present violations of OLS assumptions, it is possible to affirm that a cause of non-linearities of the LL is due to the inclusion of a fraction of these stars, that despite to be Cepheids are influential points.
For testing this hypothesis, we fit the models given by equations (26) to (28) by OLS using only Cepheids with small dispersion. The results confirm the hypothesis, as it will be described below. For this reason, we consider appropriate to summarize here the communalities of these influential Cepheids:

i) The scatter exhibited by light curves of some Cepheids classified as A2 or A3 can be associated with phase shifts, suggesting changes in the pulsational period. This effect produces a dispersion of the mean magnitudes, which moves the locus Cepheid in the PL relation.

Table 1: **Morphological classification of OGLE-II Cepheids**

	A1	A2	B1	B2	B3	C1	C2	Total
LMC	36	9	457	127	7	121	8	765
SMC	10	13	458	650	42	128	5	1306

Table 2: **Bi-dimensional classification of OGLE-II Magellanic Clouds Cepheids.**

RA	DEC	ID	Period	Class	RA	DEC	ID	Period	Class
05 33 02.35	-70 15 33.3	OGLE-LMC_SC1.25359	3.39729	B1	05 27 57.84	-69 53 48.5	OGLE-LMC_SC3.44391	2.53947	B1
05 27 43.07	-70 00 49.7	OGLE-LMC_SC3.26910	15.84364	C1i	05 27 34.14	-69 51 22.4	OGLE-LMC_SC4.417847	7.49402	C1i
05 24 57.16	-69 13 32.8	OGLE-LMC_SC5.455916	9.56961	C1	05 19 38.13	-69 37 44.6	OGLE-LMC_SC7.388032	5.66859	B1
05 15 37.55	-69 30 29.4	OGLE-LMC_SC8.112083	2.98282	B2i	05 12 06.64	-69 13 06.5	OGLE-LMC_SC10.245266	3.96572	B1
05 42 52.95	-70 40 11.9	OGLE-LMC_SC19.18756	3.48887	B1	05 22 29.04	-70 09 10.2	OGLE-LMC_SC21.187856	3.16725	B1i
00 36 55.83	-73 56 27.2	OGLE-SMC_SC1.1	14.3816	C1i	00 42 34.89	-73 25 37.2	OGLE-SMC_SC3.12578	1.29508	B2
00 44 51.77	-73 33 56.5	OGLE-SMC_SC3.178185	3.04334	B2	00 45 42.73	-72 52 39.7	OGLE-SMC_SC4.38887	1.91467	B1
00 54 32.93	-72 30 26.5	OGLE-SMC_SC6.324270	1.97277	B2	00 55 18.59	-72 43 12.2	OGLE-SMC_SC7.120090	1.59513	B2
01 01 49.84	-72 29 55.5	OGLE-SMC_SC9.73218	3.34991	B1	01 05 03.87	-72 51 52.3	OGLE-SMC_SC10.78690	1.47799	B2
01 08 17.81	-72 44 17.8	OGLE-SMC_SC11.75453	1.56745	B1	01 09 04.87	-72 20 14.5	OGLE-SMC_SC11.117272	9.15889	C1i

Note. — The first two columns are the equatorial coordinates of the Cepheid ($J2000.0$ equinox). The third column indicates the OGLE-II ID. The four column gives the period. These data were reported for the LMC by Udalski et al. (1999a), and for the SMC by Udalski et al. (1999b). The last column gives the bi-dimensional class assigned in this study. The letter i, identifies the influential Cepheids. A portion of the table is shown here for guidance regarding its form and content. The complete table is available on electronic form at the CDS.

ii) The B2 light curves exhibit a behavior that could be explained by period changes or blending effects. The dispersion of these light curves do not allow to directly establish which of these effects could be present in these types of Cepheids. In this work it is not clear which of them is more likely to be the best explanation. However, this point is out of the scope of this paper. This interesting fact could be investigated in more detail in future works.

A small fraction of the light curves classified as B3 have characteristics suggesting eclipses or blending. In the first case, the main effect of the companion on the PL relation is to move the Cepheid locus. Due to that, the total mean brightness out-of-eclipse includes the companion contribution, adding scatter in some cases up to 1.0 mag., as it was reported by Alcock et al. (2002) and Pietrzyński et al. (2010). The second case is more probable to occur, since a visual inspection of the finding charts of the B3 Cepheids, shows that most of them are blended.

iii) Light curves classified as C1 or C2 are bump Cepheids, i.e. they exhibit the Hertzsprung progression. The amplitude bump affects the Cepheid mean magnitude. This effect is stronger for periods near to the maximum light, shifting the Cepheid position in the PL relation.

In order to use the OLS regression, the White's test is applied. This test does not find enough evidence to reject its null hypothesis of homoskedasticity, with a 5% of significance, since the $P-$values associated with each model test are 0.084, 0.280 and 0.908 for the LMC, and 0.068, 0.154 and 0.440 for the SMC, respectively. However, two issues are noted: the first one is again the presence of influential points. The second fact is that the residual distributions for VIW_I LMC data (and only for the W_I SMC data) have heavier tails with respect to the normal distribution.

Since there is neither an astronomical nor statistical reason to delete those influential points

or a fraction of them, a new approach to estimate the parameters given in the models (26) to (28) is needed instead of OLS. Besides, if these influential points were deleted, new ones may appear.

We fit the models by using the M-regression. The $\rho(u)$ function used is the bi-square. Since no evidence of bad influential points is found, we check each model beginning with the slope test, which is a robust version equivalent to the F-test in OLS. The null and alternative hypotheses are: $H_0 : \beta_2 = 0$ and $H_1 : \beta_2 \neq 0$.

For each model fitted in both galaxies, the robust slope test has a P-value less than 0.0001, so at 5% of significance they are significant. The LMC V-band fitted model (26) has a R^2 value (the coefficient of determination) of 0.6248, meaning that the model explains about the 62% of the variability of V. For the LMC I-band model (27) and the LMC W_I model (28), they explain about 75% and 87% respectively of the observed variability.

We also use the robust Ramsey's test (Ramsey 1969), given by the following equations:

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \mathbf{LP} + \alpha_1 \hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{2}} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{29}$$

The null (H_0) and alternative (H_1) hypotheses are $H_0 : \alpha_1 = 0$ and $H_1 : \alpha_1 \neq 0$.

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \mathbf{LP} + \alpha_1 \hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{2}} + \alpha_2 \hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{3}} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{30}$$

The null and alternative hypotheses are $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$ and H_1 : at least one $\alpha_i \neq 0; \quad i = 1, 2.$

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 \mathbf{LP} + \alpha_1 \hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{2}} + \alpha_2 \hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{3}} + \alpha_3 \hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{4}} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{31}$$

The null and alternative hypotheses are $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = 0$ and H_1 : at least one $\alpha_i \neq 0; \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$

In equations (29) to (31), $\mathbf{y}$ is any of the magnitude vectors V, I or the W_I index. Moreover, values of α_i and β_i are different for each photometric band.

This test shows that there is not enough evidence to reject H_0 due to its $P-$values at 5% of significance. This implies that there is no evidence of specification problems in the LMC models. On the contrary, for the SMC models there is enough evidence to reject H_0 due to $P-$values obtained by the test at the same level of significance. In particular, when equation (29) is used, the LMC (SMC) $P-$values are 0.544 (0.011) for V-band, 0.424 (0.006) for I-band and 0.434 (0.013) for the W_I index. By using equation (30), the LMC (SMC) $P-$values are 0.832 (0.015) for V-band, 0.718 (0.006) for I-band and 0.714 (0.002) for the W_I index. Finally, when equation (31) is used, the LMC (SMC) $P-$values are 0.924 (0.013) for V-band, 0.882 (0.005) for I-band and 0.709 (0.004) for the W_I index.

4.1. Structural breaks

In order to verify if there are structural breaks (explained in §3.4) in model equations (26) to (28), we fit the following model:

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta_1 + \beta_2\boldsymbol{\delta} + \beta_3\mathbf{LP} + \beta_4\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{LP} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{32}$$

Each data set is split in two parts using a dummy variable represented by δ, where

$$\delta = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if P } \leq 3.60\,(2.57)\text{ d} \\ 0 & \text{if P } > 3.60\,(2.57)\text{ d} \end{cases} \tag{33}$$

The LMC (SMC) data are split around $P = 3.60$ (2.57) d, in order to secure that each data set has enough observations to avoid problems due to asymptotic results in robust regressions. As a result, each data set has 240 (219) and 247 (235) points.

The hypotheses to contrast are: $H_0 : \beta_2 = \beta_4 = 0$ and $H_1 :$ some $\beta_j \neq 0, \quad j = 2, 4$. The β_2 and β_4 parameters are associated with δ in order to detect structural breaks in the zero point (β_2) and/or the slope (β_4) of the LL, if these parameters are not significant there

is not enough evidence of structural breaks. On the contrary, if both or some of them are significant there is enough evidence of structural breaks.
The obtained LMC $P-$values are 0.886 for $V-$band, 0.775 for $I-$band , and 0.572 for the W_I index. Whereby, no evidence of structural breaks is found, hence the parameters obtained using M-estimators are stable at 5% of significance.

We use the M-regression to estimate the LMC LL throughout the following equations:

$$V_0 = 17.005 - 2.683LP + e \tag{34}$$

$$I_0 = 16.549 - 2.930LP + e \tag{35}$$

$$W_I = 15.839 - 3.315LP + e \tag{36}$$

Models explain about 62%, 75% and 87% of the variability in V-band, I-band and W_I, respectively. The confidence interval at 95% for each M-estimator for the LMC zero point (β_1) and slope (β_2) are reported in Table 3. It is worth to say that the estimators for zero point and slope obtained by OLS are included between the confidence intervals obtained by M-regression.
To summarize, the robust tests have shown that there is no evidence to have doubts about LMC models adequacy; as a result they are acceptable.

For the SMC model the P-value obtained by the test of structural breaks is less than 0.001 for all bands, implying enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis and accept H_1 at 5% of significance; i.e. there are structural breaks.

Because of the problems already detected in model equations (26) to (28) for SMC, further models analysis is needed using equation (32). Therefore the individual significance of the parameters is analyzed. To do that, the following hypotheses are contrasted: $H_0 : \beta_j = 0$ and $H_1 : \beta_j \neq 0, \quad j = 2, 4$. The individual robust test for β_2 shows it is significant at 5% of significance, due to $P-$values of 0.035 in $V-$band, 0.015 in $I-$band

Table 3: **OGLE-II LMC Leavitt law.**

	$\hat{\beta}_1$	$\hat{\beta}_2$	ZP	η
V_0	17.005 ± 0.064	-2.683 ± 0.108	17.066 ± 0.021	-2.775 ± 0.031
I_0	16.549 ± 0.044	-2.930 ± 0.074	16.593 ± 0.014	-2.977 ± 0.021
W_I	15.839 ± 0.029	-3.315 ± 0.049	15.868 ± 0.008	-3.300 ± 0.011

Note. — The reported β estimators are those given by equations (34) to (36), and were obtained by using the M-regression. Confidence radius are reported at 95%. The last columns report the zero point and slope values obtained by Udalski (2000) using OLS.

Table 4: **OGLE-II SMC Leavitt law.**

	$\hat{\beta}_1$	$\hat{\beta}_2$	$\hat{\beta}_3$	ZP
V_0	17.444 ± 0.097	0.135 ± 0.069	-2.551 ± 0.147	17.635 ± 0.031
I_0	17.019 ± 0.074	0.107 ± 0.053	-2.869 ± 0.110	17.149 ± 0.025
W_I	16.353 ± 0.052	0.063 ± 0.037	-3.342 ± 0.079	16.381 ± 0.016

Note. — The reported β estimators are those given by equations (41) to (43), and were obtained by using the M-regression. Confidence radius are reported at 95%. The last column report the zero point value obtained by Udalski (2000) using OLS.

and 0.003 in the W_I index. On the contrary, the same test for β_4 is not significant at 5% of significance since associated $P-$values are 0.566 in $V-$band, 0.381 in $I-$band and 0.090 in the W_I index. There is not enough evidence to reject H_0, i.e. $\beta_4 = 0$. It means that the model has different zero point for each data set but the same slope. Taking into account the specification problems and structural breaks detected in models (26) to (28), we fit the following model for SMC based on the previous individual significance analysis using (32):

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta_1 + \beta_2\boldsymbol{\delta} + \beta_3\mathbf{LP} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{37}$$

Using OGLE-III Cepheids, Submramanian & Subramaniam (2015) determined the inclination of the SMC galaxy's disk in 64°. The geometrical distribution of the Cepheids across this disk could explain the behavior of the LL in the SMC, observed in equation (37): linear regressions with the same slope and different zero points for each data set.
Model (37) is fitted by M-regression and no evidence of bad influential points is found. Robust Ramsey's test is applied again to check if there are specification problems in model (37). The equations and hypotheses of the test are:

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta_1 + \beta_2\boldsymbol{\delta} + \beta_3\mathbf{LP} + \alpha_1\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{2}} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{38}$$

The null and alternative hypothesis are: $H_0 : \alpha_1 = 0$ and $H_1 : \alpha_1 \neq 0$.

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta_1 + \beta_2\boldsymbol{\delta} + \beta_3\mathbf{LP} + \alpha_1\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{2}} + \alpha_2\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{3}} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{39}$$

The null and alternative hypothesis are: $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 0$ and H_1 : At least one $\alpha_i \neq 0; \quad i = 1, 2.$

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta_1 + \beta_2\boldsymbol{\delta} + \beta_3\mathbf{LP} + \alpha_1\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{2}} + \alpha_2\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{3}} + \alpha_3\hat{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{4}} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{40}$$

The null and alternative hypothesis are: $H_0 : \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = 0$ and H_1 : At least one $\alpha_i \neq 0; \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$

The test does not find enough evidence of specification problems because the $P-$values obtained at 1% of significance. In particular, for model (38) the SMC $P-$values are 0.933

for V-band, 0.817 for I-band and 0.669 for the W_I index. For model (39), SMC $P-$values are 0.370 for $V-$band, 0.224 for $I-$band and 0.040 for the W_I index. For equation (40), SMC $P-$values are 0.503 for V-band, 0.346 for I-band and 0.091 for the W_I index.

M-regression estimations for the SMC LL are shown in the following equations:

$$V_0 = 17.444 + 0.135\delta - 2.551LP + e \tag{41}$$

$$I_0 = 17.019 + 0.107\delta - 2.869LP + e \tag{42}$$

$$W_I = 16.353 + 0.063\delta - 3.342LP + e \tag{43}$$

These models explain about 75%, 82% and 87% of the variability in V, I and the W_I index, respectively. The confidence intervals at 95% for each M-estimator in the equations (41) to (43) are reported in Table 4. Besides, it is interesting that the confidence intervals for M-estimators include the values obtained by OLS, although there are slightly differences. *To summarize, robust tests show specification problems and structural break points in the SMC models (26) to (28); therefore, analysis leads to model (37) as a better choice.*

4.2. Universality of the Leavitt law

The universality hypothesis of the LL implies that the slope of the linear regression observed in the same filter in different galaxies has the same value, and shows a negligible dependence with the metallicity (García-Varela, Sabogal & Ramírez-Tannus 2013, and references therein.) In order to test the universality of the LL, a linear model to fit simultaneously the data from the LMC and SMC is proposed. This model is given by:

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta_1 + \beta_2\boldsymbol{\delta} + \beta_3\mathbf{LP} + \beta_4\boldsymbol{\delta}\mathbf{LP} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \tag{44}$$

that is fitted in V, I and the W_I index after deleting the points previously discussed. The dummy variable δ indicates if the observation is from the LMC or the SMC: $\delta = 1$ if a

Cepheid is from the SMC and $\delta = 0$ otherwise. A number of 454 Cepheids from the SMC and 487 from the LMC are used to fit this model.

The model (44) is fitted by OLS. White's test finds enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis of homoskedasticity, at 5% of significance, since the P-value is 0.017 in V, less than 0.001 in I and less than 0.0001 in the W_I index. As happened before, OLS regression is not adequate due to heteroskedasticity problems and the presence of influential points. Besides, the residuals distribution has a heavier tail than the normal distribution. Therefore, model (44) is fitted by M-regression using bi-square function. No evidence of bad influential points is found; thus, the process to check the adequacy of the model continues. The $P-$values of the slope test are less than 0.0001 in V, I and for the W_I index, so the models are significant at 5% of significance. The hypotheses contrasted are: $H_0 : \beta_2 = \beta_3 = \beta_4 = 0$ and $H_1 :$ Some $\beta_j \neq 0, \quad j = 2, 3, 4$.

To test if both galaxies have the same zero point and slope the following hypotheses are contrasted: $H_0 : \beta_2 = \beta_4 = 0$ and $H_1 :$ Some $\beta_j \neq 0, \quad j = 2, 4$.

The $P-$values obtained by the robust test are less than 0.0001 in V, I and for the W_I index; therefore, there is enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis at 5% of significance. Hence, the individual significance of each parameter must be analyzed. To do that, the following hypotheses are contrasted again: $H_0 : \beta_j = 0$ and $H_1 : \beta_j \neq 0, \quad j = 2, 4$.

The individual significance robust test for β_2, shows it is significant at 5% of significance, since its associated $P-$values are less than 0.0001 in VI and the W_I index. The same test for β_4 is not significant at 5% of significance because its associated $P-$values are 0.456 and 0.145 in V and I, respectively. This means that the model has different zero points, as we expect due to the galaxies are at different distances, but it has the same slope. As a result, the final equations fitted by the M-regression in V and I bands, after deleting β_4 are:

$$V_0 = 17.037 + 0.554\delta - 2.732LP + e \tag{45}$$

$$I_0 = 16.590 + 0.540\delta - 2.995LP + e \tag{46}$$

Confidence radius are reported in Table 5. Models (45) and (46) make an adjustment to the zero point when Cepheids are from the SMC but have the same slope for both galaxies at 5% of significance. Moreover, they explain about the 78% and 81% of the variability in V and I, respectively.

The individual significance robust test for β_4 in the W_I index is significant at 5% of significance because its associated P-value is 0.0014. It implies that each galaxy has its own regression line with different zero point and slope. It explains about 87% of the W_I variability. Following equation gives the model fitted for the W_I index:

$$W_I = 15.841 + 0.594\delta - 3.318LP - 0.129\delta LP + e \tag{47}$$

The confidence intervals at 95% for estimated parameters in equation (47) are: $15.801 \leq \beta_1 \leq 15.880$ for zero point, $0.548 \leq \beta_2 \leq 0.639$ for zero point adjustment when Cepheids are from SMC, $-3.384 \leq \beta_3 \leq -3.251$ for slope, and $-0.209 \leq \beta_4 \leq -0.05$ for slope adjustment when Cepheids are from SMC.

As a general result of this work, robust tests have shown that the LL of the LMC and SMC are universal in V and I bands. There are enough evidence of two parallel egression lines, with the same slope at 5% of significance but different zero points, as it is shown by models (45) and (46). However, for the W_I index, it has been shown that there are not a universal LL: the LMC and SMC have two completely different regression lines, as it is shown by equation (47).

4.3. Analysis with OGLE-II and OGLE-IV data

Based on the experience obtained by fitting the models (26) and (27), they are fitted for all VI mean magnitudes of fundamental mode Cepheids observed by the OGLE-II project.

We also fit these models using the OGLE-IV fundamental mode Cepheids, reported by Soszyński et al. (2015). It is worthy to say that the published OGLE-IV mean magnitudes are not corrected for extinction. All following models are fitted with the MM-regression because of its high BDP of 25%. The Least Treammed Squares and Tukey function are used.

As no evidence is found of skewness in the models for both galaxies, we proceed with the analysis. Beginning with the LMC, model slope tests are significant, as it can be seen in the $P-$values obtained: less than 0.0001 in $V-$ and $I-$band (OGLE-II, OGLE-IV). Then, the test proposed by Godfrey & Orme (1994) is performed obtaining $P-$values of 0.302 (OGLE-II) and 0.033 (OGLE-IV) in $V-$band and 0.186 (OGLE-II) and 0.0003 (OGLE-IV) in $I-$band; therefore, there is evidence of specification problems in OGLE-IV $I-$band model at 1% of significance. This could be due to blending problems and also to the lack of extinction correction in OGLE-IV data. To perform stability tests, the data are split in two data sets around $P = 3.85$ d (OGLE-II) and $P = 3.5877$ d (OGLE-IV), to have about half of observations in each set, by dummy variables. No evidence of structural breaks is found, because the $P-$values obtained, by testing $\beta_2 = \beta_4 = 0$ vs the hypothesis that at least one of them is not 0 in equation (32), are 0.601 (OGLE-II) and 0.453 (OGLE-IV) in $V-$band, and 0.810 (OGLE-II) and 0.267 (OGLE-IV) in $I-$band. Models explain about 61% and 68% of variability in $V-$ and $I-$bands respectively (OGLE-II); and 54% and 65% of variability in $V-$ and $I-$bands respectively (OGLE-IV). The estimated parameters of the models and their confidence intervals are reported in Table 6. Results for $I-$band are shown only for information purposes because of their specification problems.

The OGLE-IV LMC data were also split in around $P = 10$ d by equation (32). No evidence of structural break is found in the slope, because the P-value obtained is 0.705. However, the zero point adjustment is significative. As a result, there is evidence of two parallel regression lines.

Table 5: **Universal Leavitt law estimators.**

	$\hat{\beta}_1$	$\hat{\beta}_2$	$\hat{\beta}_3$
V_0	17.037 ± 0.047	0.554 ± 0.030	-2.732 ± 0.074
I_0	16.590 ± 0.034	0.540 ± 0.022	-2.995 ± 0.054

Note. — The reported β estimators are those given by equations (45) and (46), were obtained by using the M-regression. Confidence radius are reported at 95%.

Table 6: **Optical LMC Leavitt law.**

	OGLE-II		OGLE-IV		Soszyński et al.	
	$\hat{\beta}_1$	$\hat{\beta}_2$	$\hat{\beta}_1$	$\hat{\beta}_2$	ZP	Slope
V	17.029 ± 0.041	-2.732 ± 0.063	17.436 ± 0.025	-2.701 ± 0.038	17.438 ± 0.012	-2.690 ± 0.018
I	16.553 ± 0.029	-2.947 ± 0.043	16.823 ± 0.018	-2.922 ± 0.029	16.822 ± 0.009	-2.911 ± 0.014

Note. — The reported β estimators are those given by equations (26) to (27). They were obtained by using the MM-regression. Confidence radius are reported at 95%. The last columns report the zero point and the slope values obtained by Soszyński et al. (2015) using the sigma-clipping algorithm and OLS over OGLE-IV data. The obtained OGLE-II and OGLE-IV MM-estimators in $V-$band and their respective confidence intervals include at 1.0σ the OLS estimators reported by Udalski (2000) and Soszyński et al. (2015).

The SMC slope tests for models (26) and (27) are significant because the $P-$values obtained are less than 0.0001 for $V-$ and $I-$bands (OGLE-II, OGLE-IV). However, these models show problems. Godfrey and Orme test finds enough evidence of specification problems because of $P-$values obtained are less than 0.0001 for $V-$ and $I-$bands (OGLE-II, OGLE-IV). To perform stability tests, data are split around 2.0039 d (OGLE-II) and 1.9429 d (OGLE-IV) to have about half of observations in each data set. Enough evidence of structural breaks is found: $P-$values are less than 0.0001 in both bands (OGLE-II), for testing $\beta_2 = \beta_4 = 0$ vs the hypothesis that at least one of them is not 0 in equation (32). Besides, when individual significance tests are performed for β_2 and β_4, $P-$values obtained are less than 0.0001 for β_2 in both bands; 0.0322 and 0.0082 for β_4 in $V-$band and $I-$band respectively. As a result, in both bands there are two regression lines at 5% of significance (OGLE-II).

Unlike SMC OGLE-II models, there is not enough evidence to support that OGLE-IV slope model parameters are unstable with $P-$values 0.784 and 0.597 in $V-$ and $I-$bands respectively, while zero point adjustment, β_2 (equation (32)), is still significant with $P-$value less than 0.0001 in both bands. As a result, stability tests show that there are two parallel regression lines in both bands. Based on the individual significance analysis using model (32) for $V-$ and $I-$bands, new models are fitted. However, Godfrey and Orme test shows that specification problems persist. Nevertheless, only for information purposes, we report the slope estimated values at 95% confidence intervals for the OGLE-IV data:-2.780 ± 0.055 for $V-$band and -3.024 ± 0.046 for $I-$band.

Summarizing, the LMC models fitted with OGLE-II and OGLE-IV data are adequate except for the $I-$band model (OGLE-IV). The OGLE-II models adequacy could be explained because only $\sim$ 36% of Cepheids in the LMC has intermediate and large dispersion. Therefore, as Cepheids with small dispersion are the largest fraction, excluding intermediate and large dispersion Cepheids has no significant impact on the estimated slope value, because

confidence interval for slope ($\hat{\beta}_2$), showed in Table 6, includes the slope estimation ($\hat{\beta}_2$) showed in Table 3. Moreover, LMC fitted models with all OGLE-IV data have confidence intervals for slope that contain estimation obtained by using the models fitted with all OGLE-II data (see $\hat{\beta}_2$ values in Table 6) .

On the other hand, there is enough evidence showing that SMC models are not adequate. Unlike LMC, the largest fraction of OGLE-II SMC data ($\sim 64\%$) are intermediate and large dispersion Cepheids; as a result, when models are fitted with all data, those Cepheids are majority in the sample. The presence of a large fraction of intermediate and large dispersion Cepheids in the SMC galaxy can be explained by the geometry of this galaxy, as it was discussed in the section 4.1*. It is interesting that SMC models improve when they are fitted with OGLE-IV data because, despite of specification problems, there is not enough evidence of unstability of the slope parameter in both bands.*

5. Conclusions

Our main conclusions can be summarized as follows:

By applying the traditional OLS and robust statistical linear regression models to optical OGLE-II and OGLE-IV data, it is possible to affirm that the problems of break and non-linearity of the LL disappear for the LMC when M- or MM-regressions are used. In that case, the LL is obtained without slope breaks, as it is shown in equations (45) and (46), and it is not needed to exclude or reject points from the data sample. The models in this case are adequate and do not present specification problems or structural breaks, except in the OGLE-IV I-band, probably due to the lack of extinction correction among others causes. These facts allow to conclude that the non-linearity of the LMC LL is a consequence of using a non-adequate statistical method.

For the SMC, despite to use the robust regressions, specification, structural breaks and

adequacy problems are found. This could be caused in part by blending problems due to the geometry of this galaxy, that could be generating a large fraction of intermediate and large dispersion Cepheids, as it was discussed in section 4.1. This astronomical reason seems to imply that Cepheid variables in galaxies with elongated structures like this of the SMC are not appropriate to fit a reliable LL. In particular, for the SMC, we found that excluding the intermediate and large dispersion Cepheids, i.e. stars that exhibit the communalities of influential Cepheids, leads to avoid the adequacy and specification problems. This could be indicating that this kind of Cepheids really has influence in the fitting of the LL for galaxies with similar geometry to this of the SMC. However, from a statistical point of view, there is no reason to exclude these stars from the analysis.

The OLS method has violations to its assumptions for the LMC and SMC galaxies, with OGLE-II and OGLE-IV data, as it was discussed at the beginning of section 3.1. In particular, two important problems are worthy of mentioning here. The first one is the fact that rejecting outliers using the sigma-clipping algorithm is not adequate because the precision of the parameters is adjusted artificially, besides there are violations of OLS assumptions. Without strong non-statistical reasons to support the rejection of points, this method is invalid in the LL linear regression context. The second problem is the presence of influential points, that implies the necessity to find communalities in them. In this work we found that a fraction of Cepheids with a grade of moderate and large dispersion are influential points. The communalities exhibited by them suggest in their light curves bumps, i.e. Cepheids showing the Hertzsprung progression, or eclipsing variations, or evidence of period changes. The exclusion of these influential Cepheids from the sample using OLS regression was made to solve adequacy problems; however, new influential points appear that imply again violations to the OLS assumptions.

Although the obtained M-estimators (slope and zero point) and their respective confidence intervals include the OLS estimators reported by Udalski (2000), the relevance of using the M-estimators is that they allow to make a reliable statistical inference, since none of their assumptions are violated, unlike the OLS estimations.

When Cepheids from the LMC and SMC are combined to fit a single model, in each one of the $V-$ and $I-$bands, the linear relations remain to be valid, after deleting the Cepheids already discussed. The M-model shows that each galaxy has its own regression line differing only in the zero point. This implies that the OGLE-II Leavitt law is universal in the range of metallicities of the Magellanic Clouds. On the contrary, the combined model for W_I shows that each galaxy has its own linear regression with the expected difference in zero point, but with unexpected difference in slope. This result has already been reported in the literature, but its causes are not yet clear.

LMC models fitted by using all OGLE-II and OGLE-IV data by MM-regression are adequate, but OGLE-IV $I-$band has specification problems. These problems could be due to blending and the lack of extinction correction in these data. There is no evidence of unstability in their zero point and slope parameters. On the other hand, despite of the specification problems in SMC models for OGLE-II and OGLE-IV data, there is not enough evidence of unstability in the slope parameters when they are fitted with OGLE-IV data that have more observations compared to OGLE-II. However, when OGLE-IV data are split in $P = 10$ d, there is evidence of two parallel regression lines.

It is clear from our results that influential Cepheids do not have an important effect on the LL for the LMC. However, they could have impact in the case of galaxies with similar geometry to this of the SMC. The effect of these Cepheids in the measurement of distances to these galaxies, will be studied in a forthcoming paper.

Finally, based on the results of this work, we suggest to use the LL relations given by equations (45) and (46) as a universal law for the SMC and LMC galaxies. We also suggest

to use the slope and zero point for V-band, obtained for LMC using OGLE-IV data, shown in Table 6. For the SMC using OGLE-II without the influential Cepheids, we suggest to use the equations (41) and (42).

Authors thank the referee, Dr. Pawel Pietrukowicz, for his important recommendations and suggestions that have improved this manuscript. AGV, BES and JRM acknowledge support from Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de los Andes, through Proyecto Semilla. SVD acknowledges the Physics Department, Universidad de los Andes, for the fellowship supporting the postdoctoral position held within the Astronomy group.

REFERENCES

Aikawa, T., & Whitney, C., 1984, ApJ, 282, 527

Aikawa, T., & Whitney, C., 1985, ApJ, 296, 165

Alcock, C., Allsman, R., Alves, D., et al., 2002, ApJ, 573, 338

Babcock, H., 1958, ApJS, 3, 141

Bono, G., Marconi M., & Stellingwerf, R., 2000, A&A, 360, 245

Butkovskaya, V., Plachinda, S., Baklanova, D., & Butkovskyi, V., 2014, IAUS, 301, 393

Caputo, F., Marconi, M., & Musella, M., 2000, A&A, 354, 610

Christy, R., 1968, Quarterly Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society, 9, 13

Drapper, N., & Smith, H., 1998, Applied Regression Analysis (3th ed.; John Wiley & Sons Publication)

Fadeyev, Y., 2013, Astronomy Letters, 39, 746

Fernie, J. D., 1969, PASP, 81, 707

Fouqué, P., Arriagada, P., Storm, J., et al., 2007, A&A, 476, 73F

Freedman, W., & Madore, B., 2010, ARA&A, 48, 673

Feigelson, E. D., & Babu, G. J., 2012, Modern statistical methods for astronomy with R applications (1st ed.; Cambridge; Cambridge University Press)

García-Varela, A., Sabogal, B., & Ramírez-Tannus, M., 2013, MNRAS, 431, 2278

Gastine, T., & Dintrans, B., 2008, A&A, 490, 743

Gieren, W., Storm, J., Barnes, T., et al., 2005, ApJ, 627, 224G

Gieren, W., Pilecki, B., Pietrzyński, G., et al., 2014, ApJ, 786, 80

Gieren, W., Pilecki, B., Pietrzyński, G., et al., 2015, ApJ, 815, 28G

Godfrey, L. G., & Orme, C. D., 1994, International Economic Review, 48, 489

Harris, J., & Zaritsky, D., 2006, AJ, 131, 2514

Hertzsprung, E., 1926, Bulletin of the Astronomical Institutes of the Netherlands, 3, 115

Kafadar, K., 1983, Journal of Reseach of the National Bureau of Standards, 88, 105

Kanbur, S. M., & Ngeow, C-C., 2004, MNRAS, 350, 962K

Kanbur, S. M., Ngeow, C-C., Nanthakumar, A., & Stevens, R., 2007, PASP, 119, 512

Karp, A., 1975, ApJ 199, 448

Keller, S., & Wood, P., 2006, ApJ, 642, 834

Koen, C., Kanbur, S. M., & Ngeow C-C., 2007, MNRAS, 380, 1440

Kukarkin, B., 1937, Astr. Zhurnal U.S.S.R., 14, 125

Leavitt, H. S., & Pickering, E. C., 1912, Harvard College Observatory Circular, 173, 1

Madore, B., & Freedman, W., 1991, PASP, 103, 933

Marconi, M., Musella, M., & Fiorentino, G., 2005, ApJ, 632, 590

Molnár, L., & Szabados, L., 2014, MNRAS, 442, 3222

Montgomery, D. C., Peck, E. E., & Vining, G.G., 2012, Introduction to Linear Regression Analysis (5th ed.; John Wiley & Sons Publication)

Neilson, H., & Ignace, R., 2014, A&A, 563, L4

Ngeow, C-C., Kanbur, S. M., Bellinger, E. P., et al., 2012, Ap&SS, 341, 105

Nun, I., Pichara, K., Protopapas, P., et al., 2014, ApJ, 793, 23

Pietrzyński, G., Gieren, W., Udalski, A., et al., 2004, AJ, 128, 2815P

Pietrzyński, G., Thompson, I., Gieren, W., et al., 2010, Nature, 468, 542

Pietrzyński, G., Thompson, I., Graczyk, D., et al., 2011, ApJ, 742, 20

Pilecki, B., Graczyk, D., Gieren, W., ApJ, 2015, 809, 29

Plachinda, S., 1990, Krymskaia Astrofizicheskaia Observatoriia, 81, 112

Plachinda, S., 2000, A&A, 360, 642

Poleski, R., 2008, Acta Astron., 58, 313

Ramsey, J. B., 1969, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B, 31(2), 350

Ramsey, J. B., 1974. Frontiers in Econometrics. (ed. P. Zarembka. Nueva York; Academic Press)

Sandage, A., & Tammann, G., 1968, ApJ, 151, 531

Sandage, A., & Tammann, G., 1969, ApJ, 157, 683

Schwarzenberg-Czerny, A., 1989, MNRAS, 241, 153

Severny, A., Kuvshinov, V., & Nikulin, N., 1974, Krymskaia Astrofizicheskaia Observatoriia, Izvestiia Obs. 50, 3

Simon, N., & Schmidt, E., 1976, ApJ, 205, 162

Soszyński, I., Poleski, R., Udalski, A., et al., 2008, Acta Astron., 58, 163

Soszyński, I., Udalski, A., Poleski, R., et al., 2012, Acta Astron., 62, 219

Soszyński, I., Udalski, A., Szymański M., et al., 2015, Acta Astron., 65, 279

Strassmeier, K., 2009, A&ARv, 17, 251

Stothers, R., 2009, ApJ, 696, L37

Submramanian, S., & Subramanaiam, A., 2015, A&A, 573, A135

Tammann, G. A., Sandage, A., & Reindl, B., 2003, A&A, 404, 423

Turner, D., Abdel-Sabour Abdel-Latif, M., & Berdnikov, L., 2006, PASP, 118, 410

Udalski, A., Soszyński, I., Szymański, M., et al., 1999a, Acta Astron., 49, 223

Udalski, A., Soszyński, I., Szymański, M., et al., 1999b, Acta Astron., 49, 437

Udalski, A., Szymański, M., Kubiak, M., et al., 1999c, Acta Astron., 49, 201

Udalski, A., 2000, Acta Astron., 50, 279

Udalski, A., Wyrzykowski, Ł., Pietrzyński, G., et al., 2001, Acta Astron., 51, 221

Udalski, A., Szymański, M., & Szymański, G., 2015, Acta Astron., 65, 1

Wade, G., Chadid, M., Shorlin, S., et al., 2002, A&A, 392, L17

Weiss, W., 1986, A&A, 160, 243

White, H., 1980, Econometrica, 48, 817

Whitney, C., 1983, ApJ, 274, 830

Yohai, V., 1987, The Annals of Statistics, 15, 642

This manuscript was prepared with the AAS LaTeX macros v5.2.